



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/722,045	10/04/96	FREEMAN	96-1252.05

HM42/0618

MARY L SEVERSON  
ELAN PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH CORPORATION  
1300 GOULD DRIVE  
GAINESVILLE GA 30504

EXAMINER

SPEAR, J

ART UNIT

1615

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/18/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/722,045

Applicant(s)  
FREEMAN, ET AL.

Examiner  
JAMES M. SPEAR

Group Art Unit  
1615



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 20, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1615

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12 and 13 recites the limitation "polymer matrix" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

2

Art Unit: 1615

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks et al. 5,354,556.

Sparks et al. shows a controlled release formulation comprised of microcapsules wherein the particle size average diameter is 100 nanometers or greater. See Abstract, claim 1. The controlled release particulate powders comprise the same biodegradable polymers and active agents. See column 4, lines 3-5 and 59-60. See also column 5, lines 1-3, examples 3 and 21. The formulation is provided in effervescent forms. See column 7, lines 39-55. The skilled artisan would readily determine the requisite drug loading and pH ranges, since a controlled release composition is required. The reference does not show a D 50% between 100 nanometers and 900 nanometers. To use microcapsules within applicant's D 50 range with a reasonable expectation of success would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 1615

ordinary skill in the art. The motivation being a desire to have uniformity in dissolution and absorption rates since particles of the same or similar size and configuration are known to provide the best release and absorption profiles. Optimum bioavailability being obtained from particles most closely related in particle size. See column 10, lines 3-11 and 47-68, column 14 lines 29-52. No criticality is seen in applicant's D 50 range in the absence of unexpected results supported by scientific or clinical data.

Claims 1-22 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Spear whose telephone number is (703) 308-2457. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3592 or 308-4556.

Art Unit: 1615

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [**thurman.page@uspto.gov**].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 1235.

Serial Number: 08/722,045

Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

James M. Spear

June 18, 1998

*James M. Spear*  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1615